

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-8 and 10-26 are pending in the application.

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-8 and 10-24 are now rejected as being unpatentable over the newly cited references of BuildingLink.com (BuildingLink) in view of BJM Central (BJM).

The pending claims contain main claim 1, from which all of the other claims depend. Amended claim 1 is set forth below with indentation paragraphs with comments describing what the language means to better explain the invention.

A method of managing a real estate property comprising the steps of: The method is directed to managing a real estate property. This is typically an office building that has one or more tenants.

establishing the lease parameters of the property in a computer database. There is a computer database in which is entered the lease parameters, i.e., the space, tenant, lease terms, etc.

setting in a computer database at least one user profile of at least one tenant entity located in the property and a property manager entity related to management of the property. A tenant entity is associated with a lease. That is, the lease is to a tenant. The tenant is in the property premises. The tenant entity can be, for example, a law firm. In the case of a law firm tenant entity ABC, the user profile would be of one or more of the managing partner, the administrator, or office manager of ABC. The real estate property manager entity, for example, XYZ Property Management Company, may or may not be resident in the property. The user profile of the property manager entity is of the person(s) who has management responsibility for the property, e.g., John Smith. There is set into the database user profiles for at least one tenant entity and property management entity.

establishing in a computer database at least one vendor entity for the property and the service performed by a said at least one vendor entity. Various vendors are to perform services for the property. These can be, for example, an electrician, a plumber, cleaning service, etc. There is set into a database one or more of such entities and the services it performs. For example, Sparky Electrical Co. (vendor entity) - electrical services (services).

assigning in a computer database the attributes of the authority of a user of at least one of said tenant entity and property management entity relative to requesting a service for the property. Various attributes of authority are assigned to a user of the tenant entity and user of the management entity. For example, in the ABC law firm example above, the office manager could have attributes of requesting one or more, or all, services up to a monetary limit of say \$1,000. Perhaps the law firm does not want the office manager to request one or more specific services, such as plumbing and he/she would not be assigned this attribute. Perhaps only the administrator can request cleaning services, and he would be assigned that attribute. The user of the property management entity is assigned similar attributes, such as specifying vendor type and vendor entity and dollar limitations.

a said user of a tenant entity or property manager entity making a request for a service to be rendered for the property. The user of a tenant entity or property management entity makes a request for a service to be performed by a vendor.

routing the request for service to one of said at least one vendor entity established in said computer database. The request for services if routed to a vendor entity established in the database.

maintaining the status of the fulfillment of the service request. The vendor maintains the status of fulfillment of the service request. That is, when it will be done, how much is completed, money expended, etc.

communicating the status of the fulfillment of the service request to the user of the entity requesting the service. The user making the service request can determine the status of fulfillment of the request.

In applying the BuildingLink reference, the Examiner relies on page 4 of the document. First of all, the BuildingLink document appears to be a marketing tool. The method and system of BuildingLink appear to be directed to management of an apartment building. The method of the invention has particular applicability to management of an office building which has much more complicated management problems. Page 4 of BuildingLink sets forth a rather sketchy list, that is,

one with little or no detail, of functions that its program can perform. Without greater detail, it might even be called a "wish list" or a list into which things can be read based on hindsight.

The BuildingLink document is missing many of the features set forth in claim 1. Clearly missing from the list on page 4 of BuildingLink are the claimed features of "setting in a computer database at least one user profile of at least one tenant entity located in the property and a property manager entity related to management of the property" and "assigning in a computer database the attributes of the authority of a user of at least one of said tenant entity and property management entity relative to requesting a service for the property". (emphasis added)

These specific recitations can hardly be said to be fairly met by the listed feature on page 4 of BuildingLink of "Features Customized per Building or Residence", as appears to be relied on by the Examiner.

Claim 1 also specifically recites the steps of "establishing in a computer database at least one vendor entity for the property and the service performed by a said at least one vendor entity", "a said user of a tenant entity or property manager entity making a request for a service to be rendered for the property", "routing the request for service to one of said at least one vendor entity established in said computer database", "maintaining the status of the fulfillment of the service request", "communicating the status of the fulfillment of the service request to the user of the entity requesting the service". (emphasis added) These features are not at all met or even suggested by the broadly stated BuildingLink feature (page 4) of "Submit and Track Maintenance".

The Examiner relies on BJM for the claimed feature of establishing lease parameters in a database. Applicant does not dispute the singular aspect that establishing lease parameters of a property in a database is old. However, even if BJM is combined with BuildingLink, the result falls far short of teaching or suggesting the fully integrated method of claim 1, as discussed above, wherein vendor service requests

1. are made by authorized person (user) of a tenant or management entity;
2. the requests of 1. are made within the attributes of such user;
3. the request is matched to a list of vendors in a database;

4. the vendor maintains the fulfillment status of the request; and
5. the fulfillment status is communicated to the user making the request.

Clearly, claim 1 sets forth a novel and advantageous method that when considered in its entirety is not shown or suggested by the combination of references. Therefore, claim 1 is clearly patentable and should be allowed.

The Examiner bases the rejection of each of the dependent claims 3-4, 6-8 and 10-24 as being "inherently/obviously" taught by BuildingLink. Applicants respectfully submit that there is not a concrete teaching of any of the features of these dependent claims, many of which may not even be needed by the BuildingLink program. But the principal point to be considered is that the rejection of the dependent claims is built on a non-existent foundation since, as demonstrated above, there is no teaching or suggestion of the complete novel method of main claim 1. Therefore, these dependent claims are also patentable. In essence, the broadly stated inherently obvious rejection is primarily one of hindsight applications of various features of applicants' invention. Therefore, the rejection fails and the dependent claims also are patentable and should be allowed.

Claim 25 is rejected as obvious over BuildingLink in view of BJM and further in view of MQSeries. Claim 25 depends from claim 1 and sets forth the further feature of a computer being programmed to generate requests for services that are routed to a vendor in a database. The Examiner relies on the added MQSeries for these added features.

First, as discussed above, BuildingLink and BJM do not meet the basic subject matter set forth in main claim 1. MQSeries is a ten or so year old software program developed by IBM to run on IBM proprietary technology (probably now totally obsolete). The Credit Check application of this reference is completely irrelevant to the overall method set forth in claim 25.

In essence, the Examiner combines a broad aspect of an unrelated computer system to the specific method set forth in claim 25. This is totally improper. Also, even if the combination is improperly made, it does not teach or suggest the novel invention of claim 1. Therefore, claim 25 also is patentable.

Claim 26 depends from claim 1 and further recites the step of establishing a list of services available for the property in a database and attributing work processes and business rules to the various services of the list. The claim is rejected over BuildingLink in view of BJM and further in view of Zeanah, et al., U.S. 5,933,816.

The Examiner relies on Zeanah for the additional features of claim 26. Again, as discussed above, the basic references do not meet the novel features of claim 1, and the addition of Zeanah does not cure this basic defect. The Examiner says "However, Zeanah teaches establishing a list of services available for the property in a computer database, attributing work . . ." (column 12, liens 53-60). First of all, this is not what is written in the patent and, second, it appears to be a misunderstanding of what is disclosed.

The patent text (column 12, lines 53-60) does not mention the term "Property". It precisely says "obtains lists of possible services available from services registry component". This part of the patent actually describes the technical architecture of a software component allowing a user to select any specific application that has been created or plugged in the Zeanah shell. This type of software component is low level, completely generic, exists in all modern software, and has absolutely nothing to do with actual buildings, properties, work orders, service requests, etc.

Accordingly, the combination of references made by the Examiner does not render the subject matter of claim 26 obvious and it also should be allowed.

Claim 27 has been added. This claim depends from claim 1 and specifically recites that the property as an office building. Claims 28 and 29 also are added. These claims respectively depend from claims 1 and 25, discussed above, and recite the further steps of the vendor entering the fulfillment status of a request into a database that is available to the user of the entity making the request. The added features of claims 28 and 29 clearly are not taught or suggested in the cited art, thereby adding to claims 28 and 29 a further basis of reasons for patentability discussed above relative to claim 1. Therefore, these claims also should be allowed.

The other art cited has been considered and is not deemed pertinent.

Application No.: 09/704,322

12

Docket No.: 03188/100H005-US1

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Prompt and favorable action is requested.

Dated: November 2, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By Gordon D. Coplein

Gordon D. Coplein

Registration No.: 19,165

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 753-6237 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant